

IN THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner stated that the informal drawings submitted with the application were of insufficient quality to permit examination. Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) are submitted with the present Response. These sheets are marked "Replacement Sheet" in the top margin. Approval of these replacement drawings is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 24-35 were examined. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 24-26, 29-33 and 35 were rejected, while claims 5, 6, 27, 28 and 35 were objected to. In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants amend claims 1, 24 and 32; cancel claims 6, 33 and 34; and add new claim 36. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the aforementioned amendments and the following remarks is requested.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and consideration during a telephone interview conducted 17 December 2007. The Examiner confirmed the determinations of allowability of claims 5, 6, 27, 28 and 35 (if rewritten in independent form), as stated in the 28 September 2007 Office Action. Applicants also advanced the argument that their claimed log was different from that in the primary reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,604 to Voigt *et al.*, "*Voigt*") because the log entries correspond to different events. However, the Examiner pointed out that claim 1 did not require any particular type of event to be memorialized in the log. The present amendments to claims 1 and 24 are believed to characterize the log entries so that *Voigt*'s log of memory-map changes is distinguished.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 24 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,055,604 issued to Voigt *et al.* ("*Voigt*"). As mentioned above, and as discussed in the telephone interview, Applicants' claimed invention is believed to be distinguishable from *Voigt* because the reference teaches preparing a log of entries describing recently changed memory mapping information (*see Voigt* 1:39-42 and 4:42-48). In contrast, independent claims 1 and 24 are amended to characterize the log as containing a plurality of entries, each entry corresponding to a write operation to be performed by a storage server. Because log entries corresponding to write operations are different from log entries noting memory map changes, *Voigt* does not teach or suggest every claim element, arranged as stated in the claim. For at least

this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1 and 24.

Claims 2, 8 and 30 depend on either claim 1 or claim 24, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons mentioned in support of their base claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of these claims as well.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 7, 25, 26, 29, 31-33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Voigt* (*supra*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,880,149 issued to Cronce ("*Cronce*").

Claims 3, 4 and 7 depend on claim 1, and Applicants' review of *Cronce* failed to identify any material that would disturb the reasoning presented in the preceding section: neither *Voigt* alone, nor *Voigt* in combination with *Cronce*, teach or suggest maintaining a log of a plurality of requests, where each log entry corresponds to a write operation to be performed by a storage server. Therefore, claims 3, 4 and 7 are believed to be patentable over the references of record for at least the reasons described in support of their base claim. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Claims 25, 26, 29 and 31 depend on claim 24, for patentability of which Applicants advocated above. For reasons similar to those explained earlier, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Claim 33 is canceled, so its rejection is moot; and claim 35 is amended to depend upon claim 32, which is itself amended to be patentable, as discussed below.

IV. Allowable Claims

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner determined claims 5, 6, 27, 28 and 34 to contain allowable material. Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form, including all elements of its base claim, and is now presented as claim 36. Claim 32 has been amended to incorporate all of the elements of claim 34 and intervening claim 33. Thus, claims 32 and 36 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and

such action is earnestly solicited. (Claim 35, which depends on claim 32, is also believed to be in condition for allowance.)

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1-5, 7, 8, 24-32, 35 and 36, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-8778.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Dated: December 26, 2007

/GREGORY D. CALDWELL/

Gregory D. Caldwell, Reg. No. 39,926

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: December 26, 2007

/Katherine Jennings/

Katherine Jennings